

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ROSALIND SEARCY,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

ESURANCE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:15-cv-00047-APG-NJK

ORDER DENYING AMENDED
PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN

(Docket No. 19)

Pending before the Court is the parties' amended Proposed Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order. Docket No. 19. The Court denied the parties' initial discovery plan because it purported to provide a discovery period of 180 days, but actually provided a discovery period of 220 days. *See* Docket No. 18. The parties have now filed an amended discovery plan, which again purports to provide a discovery period of 180 days but this time provides an actual discovery period of 148 days. *See* Docket No. 19 at 2 (motion to dismiss filed on February 6, 2015; discovery cutoff of July 4, 2015). Moreover, while the parties have altered the discovery cutoff in the amended discovery plan, they failed to adjust the other deadlines to reflect the newly-sought discovery cutoff even though the Local Rules clearly require those deadlines to be calculated based on the discovery cutoff. *See, e.g., id.* at 3; *see also* Local Rules 26-1(e)(2), *et seq.* Indeed, some of the relevant discovery deadlines are now set for *after* the purported expiration of the discovery period. Accordingly, the amended discovery plan is hereby **DENIED** as the discovery cutoff is again miscalculated and the other deadlines are also miscalculated.

1 The parties are **ORDERED** to submit a discovery plan that complies with the Local Rules no
2 later than April 1, 2015.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: March 25, 2015

5
6 
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28